

ALTSHULER BERZON LLP

JAMES BALTZER
 KATHERINE G. BASS
 HAMILTON CANDEE
 MAX CARTER-OBERSTONE
 EVE H. CERVANTEZ
 CONNIE CHAN
 BARBARA J. CHISHOLM
 LISA DEMIDOVICH
 JAMES M. FINBERG
 EILEEN B. GOLDSMITH
 CORINNE JOHNSON
 SCOTT A. KRONLAND
 JONAH J. LALAS
 JUHYUNG HAROLD LEE
 DANIELLE E. LEONARD
 STACEY M. LEYTON
 AMANDA C. LYNCH
 DERIN MCLEOD
 MATTHEW J. MURRAY
 BROWNEN B. O'HERIN
 ZOE PALITZ
 JONATHAN ROSENTHAL
 MICHAEL RUBIN
 TALIA STENDER
 ROBIN S. THOLIN
 EMANUEL A. WADDELL
 ALICE X. WANG

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

177 POST ST. SUITE 300
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108
 (415) 421-7151

350 W. COLORADO BLVD. SUITE 420
 PASADENA, CA 91105
 (323) 963-8693

FAX (415) 362-8064

WWW.ALTSHLULERBERZON.COM

FRED H. ALTSHULER (1943-2024)
 FOUNDING PARTNER

STEPHEN P. BERZON
 FOUNDING PARTNER
 PARTNER EMERITUS
 SPECIAL COUNSEL

PETER D. NUSSBAUM
 JEFFREY B. DEMAIN
 DANIEL T. PURTELL
 PARTNERS EMERITUS

ALEXANDER PECHT
 FELLOW

September 22, 2025

VIA ACMS

Molly C. Dwyer, Clerk of Court
 U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
 James R. Browning United States Courthouse
 95 7th Street
 San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: *In re Trump*, No. 25-4476

Dear Ms. Dwyer:

Real Parties in Interest-Plaintiffs (“Plaintiffs”) hereby respond to the correspondence filed by Petitioners-Defendants (“Defendants”) earlier today (Dkt. 26.1).

This Court administratively stayed the District Court’s July 18, 2025 order pending disposition of Defendants’ petition for writ of mandamus. That mandamus petition has now been denied. As such, the stay is no longer in effect, and Defendants should have sought their requested relief by filing a motion to enter a new administrative stay rather than through correspondence.

In any event, Plaintiffs oppose Defendants’ request that this Court take the highly unusual step of granting a further administrative stay of a District Court order for which mandamus was denied. Disposition of an en banc petition may take weeks and is unlikely to change the result of this petition. For reasons explained in further detail in Plaintiffs’ Answer to Petition for Writ of Mandamus and Opposition to Motion for Stay (Dkt. 10.1), Defendants have failed to show that

In re Trump, No. 25-4476

Page 2 of 2

any prejudice would result from their production of the ARRPs as ordered by the District Court. By contrast, further delay in obtaining those documents (which have already been delayed by two months) will severely hinder Plaintiffs' ability to litigate, and the District Court's ability to adjudicate, the dispute that the Supreme Court contemplated would be addressed following its stay order. For these reasons, Plaintiffs oppose any further stay.

Sincerely,

/s/ Stacey M. Leyton
Stacey M. Leyton

cc: All counsel of record (via ACMS)